

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/823,443	Applicant(s) WIEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Peter A. Hruskoci	Art Unit 1797	

All Participants:

 (1) Peter A. Hruskoci.

 (2) Eugene I. Shkurko.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 December 2007
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

None

Prior art documents discussed:

None


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was agreed to amend the claims as shown in the Examiner's Amendment for the sake of clarity and accuracy. It was noted that the terminal disclaimers filed 11/30/07 were approved to overcome an obviousness-type double patenting rejection over the claims in U.S. Patent 7,258,804, and a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection over the claims in 10/936,915. It was noted by Mr. Shkurko that the instant application and 7,258,804, were commonly owned at the time the instant invention was made.